2011 Jr1 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Substitute Amendment (ASA-AB7)

Received: 01/18/2011 Wanted: As time permits For: Legislative Fiscal Bureau					Received By: jkreye				
					Companion to LRB: By/Representing: ron shanovich				
May Contact: Subject: Tax, Business - crp inc, fran			. C		Drafter: jkreye				
			e, iran		Addl. Drafters:				
					Extra Copies:				
Submit	via email: YES								
Request	ter's email:	ron.shanov	rich@legis.v	wisconsin.go	v				
Carbon	copy (CC:) to:	joseph.kre	ye@legis.w	isconsin.gov					
Pre Top	pic:	*							
No spec	cific pre topic gi	ven							
Topic:									
Job crea	ation income an	d franchise tax	deduction						
Instruc	ctions:								
See atta	ched								
Draftin	ng History:								
Vers.	<u>Drafted</u>	Reviewed	<u>Typed</u>	Proofed	Submitted	<u>Jacketed</u>	Required		
/?	jkreye 01/18/2011	wjackson 01/18/2011							
/1	chanaman 01/20/2011		phenry 01/19/20	11	sbasford 01/19/2011	sbasford 01/19/2011			
/2		csicilia 01/20/2011	mduchek 01/20/20	11	mbarman 01/20/2011	mbarman 01/20/2011			

FE Sent For:

2011 Jr1 DRAFTING REQUEST

Received By: jkreye

Assembly Substitute Amendment (ASA-AB7)

4.

Received: 01/18/2011

Wanted: As time permits				Companion to LRB:			
For: Legislative Fiscal Bureau				By/Representing: ron shanovich			
May Contact: Subject: Tax, Business - crp inc, fran				Drafter: jkreye			
				Addl. Drafters:			
			Extra Copies:				
Submit via	a email: YES						
Requester	's email:	ron.shanovi	ch@legis.w	isconsin.gov	•		
Carbon co	py (CC:) to:	joseph.kreye	e@legis.wis	consin.gov			
Pre Topic	::						
No specifi	c pre topic giv	ven					
Topic:							
Job creation	on income and	l franchise tax de	eduction				
Instruction	ons:			***************************************			
See attach	ed						
Drafting	History:						
Vers.	<u>Drafted</u>	Reviewed	<u>Typed</u>	Proofed	Submitted	Jacketed	Required
/?	jkreye 01/18/2011	wjackson 01/18/2011					
/1	1	/2 js 1/20	phenry 01/19/2011		sbasford 01/19/2011	sbasford 01/19/2011	
FE Sent For:							

2011 Jr1 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Substitute Amendment (ASA-AB7)

Received: 01/18/2011				Received By: jkreye				
Wanted: As time permits					Companion to LRB:			
For: Legislative Fiscal Bureau					By/Representing: ron shanovich			
May Contact: Subject: Tax, Business - crp inc, fran				Drafter: jkreye Addl. Drafters:				
				Extra Copies:				
Submit vi	a email: YES							
Requester	's email:	ron.shanovi	ch@legis.w	isconsin.gov				
Carbon copy (CC:) to: joseph.kreye@legis.wisconsin.gov			consin.gov					
Pre Topic	e:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
No specif	ic pre topic giv	ven						
Topic:								
Job creati	on income and	l franchise tax de	eduction					
Instructi	ons:			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
See attach	ied							
Drafting	History:							
Vers.	<u>Drafted</u>	Reviewed	Typed	Proofed	Submitted	<u>Jacketed</u>	Required	
/?	jkreye	11 WY 1/18	118	1/9 H-1A	+			

FE Sent For:

Kreye, Joseph

From:

Toftness, Jennifer

Sent:

Friday, January 14, 2011 4:16 PM

To:

Kreye, Joseph

Cc:

Reinhardt, Rob

Subject: amendment change to LRB s0005/1

Joe and Rob.

There has been a change to the amendment that we currently have drafted: \$4,000

We would like to change the deduction to provide a \$5,000 deduction for businesses having gross receipts of \$5 million. For those businesses that have gross receipts of more than 5 million, they would receive a deduction per job of \$2500.

I also believe that the original intent of the amendment might not have been completely met. I think that I asked to have the UI count be an average employee number per year, by averaging the four quarterly UI reports. I don't see that specified anywhere in the first amendment and think it's important so that if someone had, for instance, 1 employee on Jan. 1, hired 9 or 10 in the summer and ended the year with 2 that they not be able to benefit from those middle of the year hires that they no longer have. I think that's why the average is important here. Sorry if I didn't specify it.

Rob, I'm including you on this email, because we'd like to stick somewhere along the lines of \$30 million a year. We'd like to end up under the \$75 million price tag the original bill is at, but we don't want to so undershoot it that it looks puny in comparison. Can you please look at this proposal and see how close it gets us to \$30 million per year? You can talk to DOR.

Thank you,

Jenny

1/14/2011



State of Misconsin 2011 - 2012 LEGISLATURE

January 2011 Special Session



+ WLj

ASSEMBLY SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT,

	TO ASSEMBLY BILL 7
4	AN ACT to create 71.05 (6) (b) 47., 71.26 (1) (h) and 71.45 (1) (c) of the statutes;
	AM - Vx
1	AN ACT <i>to create</i> 71.05 (6) (b) 47., 71.26 (1) (h) and 71.45 (1) (c) of the statutes;
2	relating to: a job creation income and franchise tax deduction.
A COLUMN TO THE PARTY OF THE PA	The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:
3	SECTION 1. 71.05 (6) (b) 47. of the statutes is created to read:
4	71.05 (6) (b) 47. An amount equal to the increase in the number of full-time
5	equivalent employees employed by the taxpayer in this state during the taxable year,
6	multiplied by \$1,000. For purposes of this subdivision, the increase in the number
7	of full-time equivalent employees employed by the taxpayer in this state during the
8	taxable year is determined by subtracting from the number of full-time equivalent
9	employees employed by the taxpayer in this state during the taxable year, as
10	determined by the taxpayer's unemployment insurance report employee count for
11	the taxable year, the number of full-time equivalent employees employed by the
ting #	(how the toxpeyer's quarterly unemployment insurance reported)

17 18 19 20

amount equal to the person's tax liability.

NJER

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14,

15

16

21

22

23

24

Section 3. 71.45 (1) (c) of the statutes is created to read:

71.45 (1) (c) An amount equal to the increase in the number of full-time equivalent employees employed by the taxpayer in this state during the taxable year, multiplied by \$1,000% For purposes of this paragraph, the increase in the number of you the taxpayer quarterly

LRBs0005/1 JK:nwn:rs

SECTION 3

full-time equivalent employees employed by the taxpayer in this state during the taxable year is determined by subtracting from the number of full-time equivalent employees employed by the taxpayer in this state during the taxable year, as determined by the taxpayer's unemployment insurance report employee count for the taxable year, the number of full-time equivalent employees employed by the taxpayer in this state during the immediately preceding taxable year, as determined by the taxpayer's unemployment insurance report employee count for the immediately preceding taxable year. No person may claim a deduction under this paragraph if the person may claim a credit under this subchapter based on the person relocating the person's business from another state to this state and in an amount equal to the person's tax liability.

SECTION 4. Nonstatutory provisions.

(1) REQUIRED GENERAL FUND BALANCE. Section 20.003 (4) of the statutes does not apply to the action of the legislature in enacting this act.

SECTION 5. Initial applicability.

(1) This act first applies to taxable years beginning on January 1, 2011.

17

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

(END)

STATE OF WISCONSIN – LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU – LEGAL SECTION (608–266–3561)

(608–266–3561)
500/5
Insert A
business
business business business to \$4,000 for a business with grow receipts of mo greater
than \$5,000,000 in the taxable year or \$2,000 for
a businen nitt gross receigts greater tron
\$5,000,000 in the taxelle year
·

Champagne, Rick

From: Rein

Reinhardt, Rob

Sent:

Thursday, January 20, 2011 8:33 AM

To:

Champagne, Rick

Subject: FW: AB 7 and PEO's

From: Koskinen, John B - DOR [mailto:John.Koskinen@revenue.wi.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2011 4:48 PM

To: Reinhardt, Rob

Subject: FW: AB 7 and PEO's

Can you get the appropriate technical drafted to amend this along the lines Lili Crane suggests?

What else would you need from us?

From: Crane, Lili B - DOR

Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2011 4:45 PM

To: Crane, Lili B - DOR; Hardt, Diane L - DOR; Hanson, Jeffrey W - DOR; Stock, Marcella L - DOR

Cc: Koskinen, John B - DOR; Boldt, Rebecca A - DOR; Oakleaf, Michael P - DOR

Subject: RE: AB 7 and PEO's

OK, I forgot to say I told Ron that the language should include "taxpayer's quarterly unemployment insurance reports or other information as required by DOR (or DWD)" or words to that effect on page 2, lines 5, 23, and page 3, lines 13, 16. And then, also "The department shall promulgate rules to administer this subsection"

From: Crane, Lili B - DOR

Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2011 4:33 PM

To: Hardt, Diane L - DOR; Hanson, Jeffrey W - DOR; Stock, Marcella L - DOR **Cc:** Koskinen, John B - DOR; Boldt, Rebecca A - DOR; Oakleaf, Michael P - DOR

Subject: RE: AB 7 and PEO's

I spoke to Ron Shanovich about this issue. DOR would need informational reporting from the PEO to determine which employees of the PEO were providing services to the client employer. s. 461.04(4) requires the PEO to provide any employment information requested and reasonably required by the agency . . that is necessary to support a claim . . . The authority to promulgate Rules would be needed in order for DOR to say what reasonable documentation the PEO would need to provide

From: Hardt, Diane L - DOR

Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2011 4:19 PM

To: Crane, Lili B - DOR; Hanson, Jeffrey W - DOR; Stock, Marcella L - DOR

Subject: FW: AB 7 and PEO's

Where are we on this?

From: Koskinen, John B - DOR

Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2011 3:52 PM **To:** Boldt, Rebecca A - DOR; Hardt, Diane L - DOR

Subject: FW: AB 7 and PEO's

The relevant part of this string is at the very bottom.

From: Reinhardt, Rob [mailto:Rob.Reinhardt@legis.wisconsin.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2011 3:43 PM

To: Koskinen, John B - DOR **Subject:** FW: AB 7 and PEO's

John,

Here's the original email regarding the PEOs.

From: Toftness, Jennifer

Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2011 2:39 PM **To:** Reinhardt, Rob; Kreye, Joseph; Shanovich, Ron

Subject: RE: AB 7 and PEO's

Ok, sounds good. Unless I hear different, I am right now working on the assumption that everything is still fine and the draft is fine. Do you think we will have a copy of this by the end of the day?

Jenny

From: Reinhardt, Rob

Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2011 10:08 AM

To: Toftness, Jennifer

Subject: RE: AB 7 and PEO's

Jenny,

I looked at this further, and as Mr. Newcomer mentions, there is a statute in Chapter 461 that specifically states that employees of PEOs are considered to be employed by the client for purposes of tax credits and other benefits based on providing employment. So I think that policy is well established and the question is whether the draft works properly. Joe thinks it's ok, and we're still working with DOR to see if language needs to be added.

From: Toftness, Jennifer

Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2011 8:50 AM **To:** Reinhardt, Rob; Kreye, Joseph; Shanovich, Ron

Subject: FW: AB 7 and PEO's

Rob, Ron and Joe,

The email below is from someone who represents the professional employment organizations. Can you take a look at his concern and let me know if there is a problem with our amendment as drafted?

Thanks,

Jenny

From: Scott Newcomer [mailto:scottanewcomer@aol.com]

Sent: Tuesday, January 18, 2011 5:17 PM

To: Toftness, Jennifer **Subject:** AB 7 and PEO's

Hi Jenny,

Thank you for helping me out with this on such short notice.

There is language in the WI PEO statute (Chapter 461) that is intended to ensure that PEO clients remain eligible for such tax credits and economic development incentives. Section 461.04(4). The problem potentially created by AB 7 is - that to claim the credit (it is actually a deduction) the DOR will rely on "taxpayer's unemployment insurance report" to determine if there have been new hires. In the PEO relationship, that unemployment insurance report will be filed by the PEO with the PEO's state unemployment insurance account number – not the client's. This could make it difficult for a PEO client to provide the documentation required to obtain a credit for which it would otherwise be eligible to claim.

What the PEO's and small businesses of Wisconsin would like to see is general language that states that the DOR shall issue rules/procedures defining the documentation a client of a PEO can provide (i.e., certified report from the PEO listing full-time equivalent employees on which SUI was reported for the client) in order for the client to claim the credit.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Scott Newcomer Capitol Management, Inc. 4600 American Parkway, Ste. 208 Madison, WI 53718 Office: 608-242-8878 Cell: 262-389-5050

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic mail transmission and any accompanying documents contain information belonging to the sender which may be confidential and legally privileged. This information is only for the use of the individual or entity to whom this electronic mail transmission was intended. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution, or action taken in reliance on the contents of the information contained in this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately contact the sender and delete the message. Thank you.



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

State of Misconsin 2011 - 2012 LEGISLATURE

January 2011 Special Session



ASSEMBLY SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT,

TO ASSEMBLY BILL 7



and grantis iney

AN ACT to create 71.05 (6) (b) 47., 71.26 (1) (h) and 71.45 (1) (c) of the statutes;

relating to: a job creation income and franchise tax deduction.

The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. 71.05 (6) (b) 47. of the statutes is created to read:

71.05 **(6)** (b) 47. An amount equal to the increase in the number of full–time equivalent employees employed by the taxpayer in this state during the taxable year, multiplied by \$4,000 for a business with gross receipts of no greater than \$5,000,000 in the taxable year or \$2,000 for a business with gross receipts greater than \$5,000,000 in the taxable year. For purposes of this subdivision, the increase in the number of full–time equivalent employees employed by the taxpayer in this state during the taxable year is determined by subtracting from the number of full–time equivalent employees employed by the taxpayer in this state during the taxable year,

or other intermentan as required by

11

12

13

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

as determined by computing the average employee count from the taxpayer's quarterly unemployment insurance reports/for the taxable year, the number of full-time equivalent employees employed by the taxpayer in this state during the immediately preceding taxable year, as determined by computing the average employee count from the taxpayer's quarterly unemployment insurance reports for the immediately preceding taxable year. No person may claim a deduction under this subdivision if the person may claim a credit under this subchapter based on the person relocating the person's business from another state to this state and in an amount equal to the person's tax liability.

Section 2. 71.26 (1) (h) of the statutes is created to read:

71.26 (1) (h) An amount equal to the increase in the number of full-time equivalent employees employed by the taxpayer in this state during the taxable year, multiplied by \$4,000 for a business with gross receipts of no greater than \$5,000,000 in the taxable year or \$2,000 for a business with gross receipts greater than \$5,000,000 in the taxable year. For purposes of this paragraph, the increase in the number of full-time equivalent employees employed by the taxpayer in this state during the taxable year is determined by subtracting from the number of full-time equivalent employees employed by the taxpayer in this state during the taxable year, as determined by computing the average employee count from the taxpayer's quarterly unemployment insurance reports for the taxable year, the number of full-time equivalent employees employed by the taxpayer in this state during the immediately preceding taxable year, as determined by computing the average employee count from the taxpayer's quarterly unemployment insurance reports for the immediately preceding taxable year. No person may claim a deduction under this paragraph if the person may claim a credit under this subchapter based on the

2011 – 2012 Legislature Jan. 2011 Spec. Sess.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

-3 =

LRBs0015/1 JK:nwn&wlj:ph

The dopartment shell promulgate rules to

person relocating the person's business from another state to this state and in an amount equal to the person's tax liability.

Section 3. 71.45 (1) (c) of the statutes is created to read:

71.45 (1) (c) An amount equal to the increase in the number of full-time equivalent employees employed by the taxpayer in this state during the taxable year, multiplied by \$4,000 for a business with gross receipts of no greater than \$5,000,000 in the taxable year or \$2,000 for a business with gross receipts greater than \$5,000,000 in the taxable year. For purposes of this paragraph, the increase in the number of full-time equivalent employees employed by the taxpayer in this state during the taxable year is determined by subtracting from the number of full-time equivalent employees employed by the taxpayer in this state during the taxable year, as determined by computing the average employee count from the taxpayer's quarterly unemployment insurance reports for the taxable year, the number of full-time equivalent employees employed by the taxpayer in this state during the immediately preceding taxable year, as determined by computing the average employee count from the taxpayer's quarterly unemployment insurance reports for the immediately preceding taxable year. No person may claim a deduction under this paragraph if the person may claim a credit under this subchapter based on the person relocating the person's business from another state to this state and in an amount equal to the person's tax liability.

SECTION 4. Nonstatutory provisions.

(1) Required general fund balance. Section 20.003 (4) of the statutes does not apply to the action of the legislature in enacting this act.

SECTION 5. Initial applicability.

2011 – 2012 Legislature Jan. 2011 Spec. Sess.

1 (1) This act first applies to taxable years beginning on January 1, 2011.

2 (END)